

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 6, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 4 to 13, 15 to 24 and 26 to 33 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 12 and 23 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to for various informalities. Applicant will be submitting replacement drawings under separate letter.

The disclosure was objected to because “luminance space” is allegedly not defined. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended the claims to remove the term. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1 to 5, 11 to 16, 22 to 27 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,181,445 (Lin). Claims 6 to 10, 17 to 21 and 28 to 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,416,890 (Beretta). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of mapping a device dependent color value depending on a color input device to a device-independent color space. The method comprises converting the device dependent color value into a device-independent color value by using a forward model of the color input device; clipping a luminance component of the device-independent color value to a non-negative value; determining whether or not the clipped device-independent color value is outside a human visual gamut; and mapping the device-independent color value outside the human visual gamut to a boundary of the human visual gamut based on the determination result.

In contrast, Lin discloses mapping out-of-gamut colors to the boundary of the gamut by projecting the color onto the line in a color space representing neutral (gray) colors and clipping the projection at the gamut boundary. The Examiner contends that the gamut boundary, described as gamut 133 in Figure 6A in Lin, is a visual gamut. (*See* Detailed Action, Page 3.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with such a characterization of the disclosures of Lin.

Applicant submits that Lin fails to disclose or suggest clipping the color value to a boundary of a human visual gamut in a device-independent color space. Rather, Lin is only seen to disclose clipping the projection of the color at the gamut boundary of a *device*. For example, gamut 133 is described as being a simple illustration for understanding boundaries of gamuts for actual devices which are generally more complex. (*See* Column 10, Lines 30-36.) Gamut 133 is further described as a *device* gamut, when the range of colors included in gamut 131 and the range of colors included in gamut 133 are analogized to the range of colors included in the gamut of a typical scanner and the range of colors included in the gamut of a typical printer. (*See* Column 10, Lines 43-48.) However, gamut 133 is not described as being a human visual gamut.

Therefore, Lin fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. In light of this deficiency, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 12 and 23 are directed to a system and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 12 and 23 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons.

Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1956200v1